

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed February 8, 2005; reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1-30 are pending in the application with Claims 1 and 17 being in independent form.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 9-14, 17-18 and 23-28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 9-14, 17-18 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,757,326 issued to Koyama et al. (herein "Koyama et al.") in view of Japan Patent No. JP 63-222504 issued to Iwai Toru et al. (herein "Toru et al."). The rejection of Claims 1-4, 9-14, 17-18 and 23-28 is respectfully traversed.

The reference of Koyama, in Figs. 27A and 27B, discloses a feed point 371a of a first electrically conductive plate 32 that is electrically connected with a feed circuit 361 of the wireless apparatus circuit block 36 through an antenna terminal 373, and a feed point 372b of a second electrically conductive plate 33 that is electrically connected with a feed circuit 361 of the wireless apparatus circuit block 36 through an antenna terminal 374.

Thus, Koyama also fails to disclose a wireless device where the conductive ground has at least one side that is approximately one-quarter wavelength of a radio wave transmitted from the antenna. Koyama discusses a width of a "slot" between two conductive plates, not a length of a side of the conductive plate. As seen in Fig. 22, Koyama teaches conductive plates 32 and 33 each having side portions 321 and 331, respectively. Koyama teaches that the width of the slot 342 between the conductive plates 32 and 33 determines the tuning frequency, and that when the frequency is high (wavelength is short), the width of the slot 342 needs to be reduced. Thus, Koyama teaches when the frequency is 100 mMHz, the

appropriate width of the slot 342 is about 5 to 9 mm, and when the frequency is 300 mMHz, the appropriate width of the slot 342 is about 3 to 7 mm.

Toru, in Fig. 1 and the Abstract, teaches a distance between an antenna board and an earth plate. In Fig. 1 of Toru, a rectangular antenna board 3 is fitted in parallel with the earth plate via plural rod shaped short-circuit posts 2' and feeding points 4, 5 are provided between the earth plate 1 and the antenna board 3 at a symmetrical position around the short-circuit post arrays 2. The distance d1 is the distance between the antenna board 3 and the earth plate 1, and is selected to a value smaller than the wavelength. The distance d2 is the distance between the short-circuit posts 2', and is selected to a value smaller than 1/10 wavelength.

Neither distance d1 nor d2 is a length of a side of a conductive plate, as recited in independent claims 1 and 17. The present invention recites that a side of the conductive plate should be approximately one-quarter wavelength of a radio wave transmitted from the antenna. The present invention teaches one conductive ground, and discusses the length of the side of the conductive plate. Toru, on the other hand, teaches a distance between an antenna board and earth plate, and a distance between short-circuit posts.

Thus, Koyama teaches a width of a slot size between two conductive plates, and Toru teaches a distance between an antenna board and earth plate, and a distance between short-circuit posts. The references of Koyama and Toru, individually or in combination, fail to teach that a side of the conductive plate should be approximately one-quarter wavelength of a radio wave transmitted from the antenna.

Claim 17 recites similar language as noted above in Claim 1. Claims 2-4, 9-14, 18 and 23-28 depend from Independent Claims 1 and 17 and thus are limited by the language recited in those independent claims. Therefore for at least the reasons given above, Applicants

respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 1-4, 9-14, 17-18 and 23-28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Koyama et al. in view of Toru et al. and allowance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claims 15-16 and 29-30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 15-16 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Koyama et al. in view of Toru et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,314 issued to Munson et al. (herein "Munson et al.").

Claims 15-16 and 29-30 depend from Independent Claims 1 and 17 and thus are limited by the language recited in those independent claims. Munson et al. fails to overcome the deficiencies of Koyama et al. and Toru et al. discussed above regarding Claims 1 and 17. Therefore for at least the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 15-16 and 29-30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Koyama et al. in view of Toru et al. and allowance thereof.

III. Objection of Claims 5-8 and 19-22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5-8 and 19-22 are objected to as being dependent upon Independent Claims 1 and 17. The Independent Claims 5-8 and 19-22 contain allowable subject matter is appreciated. However for at least the reasons given above for Claims 1 and 17, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to Claims 5-8 and 19-22 and allowance thereof.

IV. Conclusions

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-30, are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:jam